



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,421	09/16/2003	Ryan Bremer	039363-0703	3203
30542	7590	01/19/2007	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP P.O. BOX 80278 SAN DIEGO, CA 92138-0278			NASHED, NASHAATT	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				1656

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/664,421	BREMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nashaat T. Nashed, Ph. D.	1656	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 15-19 and 120-141 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 15-19 and 120-141 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/13/06 and 8/21/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1656

The application has been amended as requested in the communication filed November 2, 2006. Accordingly, claims 15-17, 19, 120-129, 132, 134, and 135 have been amended.

Claims 15-19 and 120-141 are pending and under consideration.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15-19, and 120-141 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 2004/0146942 ('942, IDS reference: A3, Weihe *et al.*) in view of the state of the art as exemplified by U. S. patent 6,197,495 ('495), 6,465,484 ('484), and WO 01/87887 ('887).

Claims 15-19, and 120-141 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mochizuki *et al.* (IDS reference: A187, J. Biol. Chem. 1999, 274, 18659-18666) in view of the state of the art as exemplified by U. S. patent 6,197,495 ('495), 6,465,484 ('484), and WO 01/87887 ('887).

In response to the above rejections, applicants amended the claims and traverse the rejection and argue that the prior art patent does not identify all elements of the claimed method, and independent claims 129 and 134 have not been addressed in the previous Office action.

Applicants' arguments filed 11/2/06 have been fully considered, but they are found unpersuasive. All claims including independent claims 129 and 134 have been addressed in the previous Office action. The phrase molecular scaffold is understood by the examiner to mean a lead compound or a pharmacophore. See the definition in the specification at page 7, paragraph 15. Independent claim 129 and 134 require three steps. The first is identifying a molecular scaffold, presumably, through the use of the atomic coordinates of the instant application using commercially available computers and software available software or selecting a known compound that inhibit protein kinases, see both '484 and '887 patents. The second and third steps require using said computers and software to identify how the selected scaffold bound the PIM-1 and identify derivatives that improve the binding to PIM-1. The three steps are carried out *in silico*, i.e., within the computer environment using commercially available computers and software. Even, the lead compounds were known in the prior art, see the '484 and

'887 patents. The only difference between the cited prior art and the claimed invention are the atomic coordinates taught in the specification, which is non-functional descriptive material. A method used for its known purpose to compare data sets does not become nonobvious merely because a new data becomes available for analysis. Nonfunctional descriptive material cannot render nonobvious an invention that has otherwise been obvious. See *In re Gulak*, 703 F2d 1381, 1385 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Also, the ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to synthesize various derivatives of those compounds taught in prior art such as those in '484 and '887 patents to identify more specific and selective inhibitors of the kinase activity of PIM-1.

No claim is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nashaat T. Nashed, Ph. D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0934. The examiner can normally be reached on MTWTF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen K. Bragdon can be reached on 571-272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1656

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Nashaat T. Nashed, Ph. D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1656